REMARKS

In the Office Action of March 27, 2008, claims 1, 3-6, 10-12, 14, and 20-21 were rejected under Section 103(a). Claims 1, 3-6, 8-12, 14, 20, and 21 have been rejected for being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,632,191 ("Headley") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,985,153 ("Kuroda"). Claims 7 and 13 have been rejected for being unpatentable over Headley in view of Kuroda, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,743,192 ("Sakota"). Independent claims 1 and 20 have been amended to more particularly recite the claimed subject matter and, for reasons that will be described in greater detail herein, it is believed that these claims and the claims dependent therefrom are patentably distinct from the prior art of record, so it is respectively requested that these rejections be withdrawn and the presently pending claims be allowed.

Independent claims 1 and 20 have been amended to clarify that processing the collected blood includes removing at least a portion of one of the separated components from the processing chamber. The step of disconnecting the source from the fluid circuit has also been clarified to recite that said disconnection occurs after at least a portion of one of the blood components is removed from the processing chamber and before all of the blood in the fluid circuit is processed in the processing chamber. This is clearly distinguishable from the prior art relied upon by the Examiner, and namely Headley which, as described in great detail in an amendment dated January 25, 2008, only describes systems wherein a donor is disconnected from the system before processing begins or after processing ends.

Even assuming *arguendo* that Headley does suggest mid-processing disconnection of a blood source, it does not teach or suggest the claimed method of disconnecting the blood source after removal of a blood component from the processing chamber begins. As described at column 4, lines 1-8, the system of Headley separates blood in a rotor into plasma and red blood cells, then removes the plasma (before the red blood cells) from the rotor. The donor is disconnected from the system before the plasma is urged from the rotor. Hence, all of the components remain in the rotor until after the donor is disconnected. Additionally, Headley includes safeguards to prevent component removal from the rotor before donor disconnection, such as the control unit described at column 5, lines 34-37. Therefore, Headley teaches away from the claimed method of disconnecting the donor from the system after removing at least a portion of one of the blood components from the processing chamber.

As Headley fails to teach or suggest the claimed subject matter or otherwise render it apparent, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of the pending claims be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.

Date: May 23, 2008

By: /Joseph R. Freund/
Gary W. McFarron
Reg. No. 27,357
Joseph R. Freund
Reg. No. 55,191

200 W. Adams Street, Ste. 2850
Chicago, IL 60606
Phone: (312)236-8500
Fax: (312) 236-8176

Customer No. 69275